

ting of commissary privileges, losses to the Government of trained personnel increase. By the failure of pay to meet the standards needed to provide for a family in the manner which the soldier's counterpart in experience, age, and education can do, trained men leave the service for the good of their families. By the constant promise of future benefits at cost of present discomfort, and then the possibility of reduction of future benefits, it is no wonder that the soldier has no faith in his Government to support him in his time of need. The President has stated his desire that the military become first-class citizens, yet a college graduate with nearly 6 years of experience earns less than half the salary of a typist.

A pay raise, not only in basic pay, but in quarters and subsistence allowances, is essential to keep trained, capable individuals in the service. Retention of trained people is clearly a desirable and money-saving proposition.

To not give a raise could cause far more expense to the Government due to constant replacement of trained personnel than the cost of a good pay increase.

As an Army officer and citizen of Ripon, Wis., I urgently request your support for an increase in military pay.

RICHARD P. YATES,
Captain, QMC,
Chief, Subsistence Branch.

World's Image

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the public image on which the United States spends millions of dollars annually is suffering from malnutrition as a result of the actions in Selma, Ala. The shock of brutality in Alabama has vibrated to all parts of the world. The nonwhite populations in foreign countries are listening and viewing these events with consternation. The police assaults on the marchers in Selma must make foreigners wonder if democracy practices what it preaches.

The primary reason why we must attack the problems of discrimination is rooted in our basic commitments as a nation and people. Discrimination due to race, color, and religion should be eliminated not to make others think better of us but because it is incompatible with the principles to which our democratic society is dedicated.

As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and in my travels abroad, I have been asked by foreign correspondents in African nations why a democratic country like the United States portrays a global image that the white race is superior or entitled to special privileges because of race. The Soviets and particularly the Red Chinese are using the Selma incidents to propagandize the nonwhite nations that the color of people is the determining factor for classifying citizenship in Alabama. Pictures showing scenes of brutality in Selma are being distributed in Asia by the Red Chinese.

The United States is widely regarded as the home of democracy and the leader of the struggle for freedom, for human rights, and for human dignity. We are expected to be the model and no higher compliment could be paid to us. So our failure to live up to our proclaimed ideals are noted and magnified and distorted.

Racial discrimination and its exploitation by the Communists have injured our international position. The reason we have not suffered greater damage is that we have made progress in removing discriminatory laws and practices and have advanced to full equality. We must regain our lost image by demonstrating to the world that our Nation will not tolerate racial and social injustices among its citizens.

Who Speaks for the Church?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in the March 28 issue of the Washington Star there appears an article by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate, entitled "Who Speaks for the Church?" It is an excellent article. It deserves to be read by every clergyman in the Nation, as well as by laymen. Dr. Harris wonders aloud how so many of our clergymen can ignore or "sweep under the rug" the Communist threat, while concentrating their efforts on other causes, however well meaning they may be. He notes that:

Among those who are assuming national and world leadership among the churches, it must be admitted that so far as communism is concerned, there is, to use a Scriptural phrase, "a silence that could be heard in heaven."

The article follows:

WHO SPEAKS FOR THE CHURCH?

(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain, U.S. Senate)

A fear-haunted question is raised in a recent letter from a highly intelligent life-long friend, prominent in the affairs of a great Eastern city. He poses an agonizing query growing out of the disruption and dislocation in the contemporary yeasty humanity. He asks, "Into what kind of a world are our grandchildren headed?" An influential Communist, who is a Judas to his U.S. citizenship, answered in the dedication of a book he wrote some years ago—"To my great-grandson, J.W.K., who will live in a Communist United States." That would mean that he would live under a coercive government where the vote is not denied to just a tiny minority but in a system in which no one is allowed to vote except where the ballot is stamped by a dictator.

Concerning the right to vote in our land, this is a time of seething emotion bordering on hysteria. In some demonstrations dunce caps and martyr halos are strangely mixed.

In such a time it needs to be said, especially to the churchmen who are so aroused, that in facing squarely domestic adjustments to meet the tests of true government by the people, the unpardonable sin is for Americans out of zeal to redress any national flaws,

to allow themselves, unknowingly, to be used by a sinister world conspiracy against human dignity. This blasphemous system is engaged in a lying world campaign to utterly distort the true image of this Nation of our pride and prayer. The hate America propaganda, whose poison is being blown around the planet, is born of communism's fear complex that the United States, with its material and moral might, is the one and only power that can thunder to this scourge of fetters—"You shall not pass." Never in history has there been such a colossal campaign to peddle lies about any country. Lenin's directions are now in full operation that any distortion or perversion is permissible if it advances the cause he fathered.

For instance, one of the charges being made about "imperialistic America" is that the one-tenth of its population belonging to the Negro race, the descendants of slaves snatched from the savage tribes of Africa, are here treated with contempt, denied all opportunities for advancement, and in spite of the Emancipation Proclamation held in virtual subjection. American Negroes thousands of miles from home, members of Joey Adams entertainment group touring the world, nailed down that lie at a public question and answer period in a foreign country. They were being taunted by communistic stooges about the place of their race in America. One of the quartet indignantly answered for them all. Glaring at the questioners he said: "Listen, Pals, outside of heaven there is only one place I want to be and that's the United States. Sure, we got problems, but we've got laws, and we've got courts, and we've got millions of Americans of all races and creeds and all colors, who are willing to lay down their lives to make possible the freedom of a man called Abraham Lincoln. We've got it made in our country!" This black man was exposing the fiction of the communistic line.

Let no one in America, now deeply concerned about voting rights for some groups belonging to one-tenth of our population, be so naive as to be oblivious to the ugly fact that the communistic conspiracy which is out to deny the sacred right of the vote for everybody, is using the present agitation in America to advance their own evil cause. There is more back of that statement that can be put in this article.

The question we are raising here, with no condemnation for religious leaders who are marching today in a cause that grips their conscience, is: Have these same leaders any vivid realization of what is in store for all Americans if the world objectives of that blasphemous, godless system, are attained? And, make no mistake about it, it is so far on its way as to blanch our faces with fear. But with this menace hanging like a Damascus sword over the fragile thread of our liberties, are these same religious leaders so vociferous now as they deal with growing pains of a democracy, equally vocal as they face the most dastardly system the ages have known? It is a tragic fact that the answer to that question must be "No." Among those who are assuming national and world leadership among the churches, it must be admitted that so far as communism is concerned, there is, to use a scriptural phrase, "A silence that could be heard in heaven."

One of these leaders has said, "Let us quit moralizing about communism and to communism." His word for that conspiracy, and that of many of his colleagues, is accommodation, coexistence, cooperation. We are speaking now of Protestant leadership. Thank God the Roman Catholics are arrayed against religion's most malignant foe. Would to God that in every church in America the perils of this godless force were being poured into the minds of the young—and, of the older. Would that every church, as its bounden duty, would have its entire mem-

A1518

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

March 30, 1965

bership familiar with every chapter of J. Edgar Hoover's "Masters of Deceit." There could be no more effective antidote to the tragically mistaken attitude of some church leaders as they encourage the coming generation to stroke the ferocious leopard (which has not changed its spots) and to murmur, "pretty pussy."

It is high time for religious people of every name or sign to raise the question in this time of dire crisis, "Who speaks for the church?"

The Buddhists' Role in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, over 2 years ago I warned that some of the Buddhists were being used by the Communists in their efforts to subvert the nations of southeast Asia.

As you recall, Mr. Speaker, Buddhist demonstrations against the government of the late President Diem for alleged religious persecution played a big part in the crisis in that country.

As I feared and as I predicted, these activities have not ceased after the tragic murder of President Diem. Buddhist-led and inspired demonstrations against the successive governments in Vietnam have aggravated the political situation in that country and have hampered the government's efforts directed against Communist Vietcong subversion and guerrilla warfare.

Just the other day, my attention was called to an article relating to this subject which appeared in the March 13, 1965, issue of the Hong Kong Tiger Standard. I am inserting that article in the RECORD at this point, and I wish to commend it to the attention of the Members of the House.

BUDDHIST CHIEFS BACK VIETCONG

Moscow.—A Communist correspondent reported in the newspaper Pravda today that South Vietnamese Buddhist leaders are on the Communist side.

Wilfred Burchett, Australian-born freelance newsman wrote that South Vietnam's Buddhists from the highest to the lowest ranks "understand that American intervention is the only cause of a continuation of the war."

"Their movement has taken on a decisively anti-American coloring and cooperation between the Buddhists and the (Communist) National Liberation Front is being carried on at all levels.

"Two respected Buddhist leaders are members of the Central Committee of the National Liberation Front," Burchett wrote.

The Moscow-based newsman made the statement in the concluding article in a series of reports he made on a recent visit with rebel Vietcong forces in South Vietnam.

Meanwhile, the Buddhist Institute of Saigon (Vien Hoa Dao) today issued a communique officially confirming that the "movement for the safeguard of peace and the happiness of the people" sponsored by Senior Monk Thich Quang Lien had no link with the institute.

The communique said the movement stemmed from Thich Quang Lien's personal initiative and that the institute now regarded the matter as "settled."

The communique was signed by Senior Monk Thich Nhat Thien, chief of the institute's press service, after a meeting of institute leaders. The communique actually confirmed statements made earlier this week by institute director, Thich Tam Chau, who is the second highest ranking bonze in the Buddhist hierarchy.

The communique also charged that Thich Quang Lien had failed to honor a promise he had made to dissociate himself from the movement.

Meanwhile, Thich Quang Lien told the press he had no intention of resigning from his post as president of the movement.

Thich Quang Lien added: "Our movement is actively continuing to establish contacts with various political and religious organizations in order to achieve as rapidly as possible the aim laid down by the movement—the return of peace in Vietnam."

The "Association of Unified Buddhism for Vietnam" today announced that its scheduled annual general assembly would open next Sunday, and not tomorrow as initially planned.

The meeting, to be held in Saigon's central pagoda, was expected to last 2 or 3 days and review Buddhist developments for the past year as well as to fix a "program of action" for the current year.

Informed sources said it was probable the association would use the occasion to examine Vietnam's present situation and define its attitude toward the major problems facing the country.

The meeting will be presided over by superior bonze, Thich Tinh Khiet, supreme leader of the Unified Buddhists of Vietnam.—AP and AFP.

Constitutional Convention May Become Reality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MASTON O'NEAL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, when the President delivered his message on voting rights to a joint session of Congress one of the things that shocked millions of television viewers was the spectacle of robed Justices of the Supreme Court sitting on the front row enthusiastically applauding the more controversial details of his proposals.

Some of these Justices appropriately refrained from doing so but the sight of the Chief Justice and a few others clapping mightily was the equivalent of watching the referee and other officials joining the cheering section of one partisan crowd immediately prior to making "impartial" decisions on the football field.

Mr. Speaker, this is shocking, but we have become enured to these tragic travesties in recent years and there lies the awful rub.

My friend Lee Kelly, editor of the Thomasville, Ga., Times-Enterprise, discussed the Court and its decisions in a recent column of that fine newspaper. I commend this to my colleagues and all others who might want to read an intelligent discussion of this trend and the necessity for a constitutional amendment because of one recent decision:

[From the Thomasville (Ga.) Times-Enterprise, Mar. 27, 1965]

OBSERVATIONS: CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION MAY BECOME REALITY

(By Lee E. Kelly)

There is a growing conviction among many people in various parts of the Nation, that something must be done to stem the powers now being exercised by the U.S. Supreme Court, which has seemed at times to be more concerned with interpreting laws in line with what the jurists would like to see rather than what Congress intended the law to be.

Outstanding among these laws, was that dealing with civil rights, in which matters of sociology seemed to have more bearing on their decision than the provisions of the Constitution.

Another major item in a long string of decisions, was that dealing with reapportionment of the membership of the general assemblies of some of the States, Georgia among them. It also had to do with reapportionment of the membership of the House of Representatives of the United States.

The decisions in a number of cases seem to run counter to accepted interpretations of the Constitution, particularly as they relate to the right of the people of a State to determine the manner and method for electing their representatives in the lawmaking bodies of their State.

There has been talk at times of strong action by Congress to reassert its lawmaking prerogatives which at times appear to have been usurped by the High Court. Failing to have action by that body there has been talk of having a Constitutional Convention, the purpose being to write an amendment to the Constitution outlawing the Supreme Court decision requiring houses of State legislatures to be reapportioned by population.

So far, 21 States have petitioned Congress to this end, and only 13 more are needed to effectuate the desired action. The 34 States would mean that desired two-thirds of States approved the proposal for a Constitutional Convention, and their action could cause Congress to go along with it.

The petition procedure never before has been employed in our country, and it is pointed out, it may not be exercised in this case, if Congress should go along with a Congress-approved amendment, to accomplish the desired end rather than take a chance of having the matter settled in a Constitutional Convention.

From past history, however, it is foreseeable that without the threat of a successful petition, the Congress would not take any affirmative action to set aside the High Court decision.

The fact that one of the two legislative bodies in seven States other than those that have petitioned Congress, have taken petition measures, reflects the determination of the states to bring the matter to a head. They appear to have both the power and the determination to do it. They are under pressure from the people in their own States, who want the present era of confusion and disorder arising from reapportioning decisions to be ended.

The Supreme Court apparently intends to eventually nullify the Constitution through substitution of its own decrees as the law of the land. The effect of such continued procedures is obvious and in the end we could have an era of rule by men rather than by law, yet the High Court is sworn to uphold the law.

The original concept of a well-balanced republican form of government was that we should have a lawmaking body to pass laws, a supreme court to rule upon their constitutionality in line with the words of the Constitution, and an executive department to administer the laws. Now the Court and the executive department have about canceled out the need of the Congress, by substitution of their own rules and views.

March 30, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

6105

mind that our stubborn balance-of-payments problems force us to rely less on monetary policy and more on fiscal policy in fostering economic growth. As you know, we are now well launched upon a program to bring our balance-of-payments deficits to a swift and sure end. But there is little likelihood that the success of that program will permit us to shift more of the burden of sustaining domestic economic advance to monetary policy. High interest rates abroad and other structural imbalances in the world's capital markets will force us to continue, for the foreseeable future, to place our chief reliance on fiscal policy to keep our economy healthy and strong.

FLEXIBILITY OF TAX RATES

But fiscal policy will not fulfill—as it must—its potential as a force for strong and stable economic growth, until we can employ it as a weapon to forestall—and not merely react to—recession. Thus, the President recommended in his economic message that the Congress take steps to insure “that its procedures will permit rapid action on temporary income tax cuts if recession threatens.” This is a reasonable alternative to the recommendation made by the Commission on Money and Credit that the President be given discretionary authority to reduce tax rates when recession threatens. For, it allows us to deal with the problem of rapid and temporary fiscal adjustments while maintaining unchanged our traditional congressional control over taxes. It requires only the assurance of a prompt congressional vote whenever a temporary tax cut proposal is made by the President. The Congress can adopt whatever procedures it believes necessary to assure prompt action. But prompt action is absolutely essential since delay in the face of oncoming recession could easily cost the Nation billions of dollars in production and hundreds of thousands, or even millions, of jobs.

EXPENDITURE POLICY

No matter, however, how versatile and potent a weapon we make of fiscal policy, we will continue to face critical choices in actually bringing it to bear upon our economic needs and problems. No simple arbitrary formula can tell us how to make those choices. A growing economy inevitably brings rising Government expenditures—and confronts us with difficult decisions on how those expenditures should be made. A normal year's economic growth—such as an increase of \$40 billion in gross national product—means that total expenditures in our society will have grown by \$40 billion. For that is just what GNP is—the sum of all the final expenditures in our economy. Much of this growth can and should be in the things we buy, privately and individually, for ourselves. But as our economy and our wealth expand, so does our need for public services, and so does the capacity of State, local, and Federal Government to meet these needs. We must decide, each year, how many of our urgent public needs we should meet out of our growing productive capacity, which programs deserve priority, and which can be cut back.

These choices inevitably involve tough decisions like those we have recently made on Navy yards, veterans hospitals, and customs collectors. They also involve programs of enormous promise, such as the Peace Corps, improved education or the war on poverty. Too often in the past such decisions have simply been the accidental byproducts of a confrontation between an alliance of the advocates of various expenditure programs on the one side and the opponents of all expenditure programs on the other. I am not at all sure that this approach, has been very effective in weeding out expenditure programs—and I particularly doubt that it has succeeded in weeding out the least worthy ones.

But here again there is an alternative approach, which is simply the careful analysis of costs and benefits in particular programs. This is the kind of analysis that has gone into the development of our defense programs, into the veterans hospital program and that is now being used in evaluating the supersonic transport program. It is in this direction—rather than in arbitrary budget ceilings—that we must seek for solutions in trying to allocate expenditures between the public and the private sectors of our economy.

Apart from the economic aspect of our fiscal policy, we must also consider its human aspects. That is why we have emphasized both the incentive and the equity aspects of our tax proposals. What we have said about incentives has fallen on fertile soil, but what we have said about equity has often fallen on harder soil.

While we all agree that we should have a tax system that is progressive in its impact, we do not all agree on just how progressive it ought to be. This is not surprising, but it has its unfortunate aspects. For a great deal of our concern about this problem of progression—or “vertical equity”—has unintentionally drawn attention away from the equally serious problem of “horizontal equity”—the unfair tax treatment of different individuals at basically similar income levels.

CAPITAL GAINS AT DEATH AND THE ESTATE TAX

Perhaps the most important problem in this area of “horizontal equity” lies in the treatment of capital gains at death. Under our present law, a man who accumulates wealth during his lifetime from earned income and dividends will pay substantial income taxes during his lifetime on this income—and estate taxes will also be levied on what he has left. Yet a second man whose investment has been in low dividend, high growth stocks may accumulate the same amount of wealth through increasing stock values. If he keeps these securities for his entire lifetime, he will receive the same estate tax treatment as the first man, but will never have paid any income tax on the increase in his wealth.

I see no justification for such widely disparate tax treatment of two individuals who through choice or circumstance happen to follow a different financial strategy for making money. Such treatment distorts the natural pattern of investment by placing a high premium on tax advantage. Why sell an asset whose value has increased and thereby incur a capital gains tax, if that tax can be avoided by holding on to the asset until death? By thus interfering with the free flow of capital in the market we unintentionally sap the vitality of our free enterprise system and harm both the economy and the Nation. In addition, such treatment of capital gains erodes the tax base and increases the tax burden on all who cannot benefit from this provision.

In the light of the administration's unsuccessful efforts to solve this problem in 1963, it seems likely that consideration of possible alternatives for providing more equitable treatment of capital gains at death should be coupled with a thorough review of our taxes on estates and gifts. These taxes have not been subjected to such a review for many years and their modernization deserves a high priority. For one thing, a thorough review of estate tax exemptions and rate schedules seems clearly in order.

TREATMENT OF LOWER INCOME TAXPAYERS

On the problem of “vertical equity”—the treatment of taxpayers at different income levels—there has been much concern over how the tax burden is distributed between the very rich on the one hand and everyone else on the other. As a result, we have given little attention to the progressivity of our

system in the middle- and lower-income groups, which include most of our citizens.

The fact is that our tax system involves very little progression between the lowest brackets and those of taxpayers with up to about \$15,000 of income. Furthermore, whatever progressivity the individual income tax has at these levels is offset to a considerable extent by regressive taxes elsewhere in our tax system.

Clearly, we do not give adequate tax relief to those with very low incomes. For instance, the biggest jump in progressivity is at the start of the very first bracket, where we jump from a zero rate all the way to 14 percent.

Although it may be surprising to some, the fact is that, over time, the income tax bite increases more at low levels than it does at high levels. In 1955 the poorest one-fifth of American families had an average income tax rate of 2.9 percent. By 1961 this had risen to 3.6 percent. On the other hand, the 5 percent with the highest incomes had an effective tax rate of 18.9 percent in both years even though, in 1955, that 5 percent included all families with incomes of over \$13,000, and in 1961 it only included families with incomes of over \$16,400. Clearly an income tax with fixed rates and exemptions tends to become less and less progressive with the passage of time.

These considerations bear directly upon our current intention to reduce excise taxes, which are particularly regressive. In the longer run, they require that we give serious thought to the structure of our tax system at the lower income levels. We made a beginning in this direction in the Revenue Act of 1964 with the minimum standard deduction, a new method of lessening the tax burden of those who can least afford to carry it. But both interests of tax fairness, as well as the need to lighten the burden of true poverty, call for further action.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE CORPORATE AND THE INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX

The final issue of tax equity I would like to stress concerns the interrelationship between the corporate tax and the individual income tax. We often hear the claim that dividends are subject to double taxation. But if one devotes any time to this matter, it becomes quite clear that at some income levels and with some dividend distribution policies, the total tax burden on corporate income can be less than the total tax burden on income earned directly, say, through a proprietorship or a partnership.

One serious problem is the question of just who pays the corporate tax. There has been a great deal of theoretical speculation about this very complex problem. Yet even with the careful statistical analyses of recent years we are still far from agreement.

Should we eventually decide that the tax is largely borne by shareholders, the issue of the so-called double taxation of dividends must then be considered hand in hand with the issue of the appropriate treatment of retained earnings. For retained earnings ultimately increase stock values and so contribute to capital gains—which brings us back full circle to issues such as the treatment of capital gains at death.

These, then, are some of the many problems and prospects that lie ahead in fiscal and tax policy. What is clear is that our problems are continually changing. If we are to keep up with the times we must continually attack them with the newest and best tools of analysis in a climate as free as possible of old prejudices. That is the unchanging challenge that is always before us.

USE OF RIOT GAS IN VIETNAM

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 min-

6106

ute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it would be interesting to know how much time has been required of administration spokesmen to explain the use in a few instances of riot control agents—super tear gas—against Communist Vietcong guerrillas. Those who profess so much concern about the use of these agents would do well to remind themselves that we are up to our ears in trouble in southeast Asia, and the chances are that situation is going to get worse before it gets better. I have a lot more interest in seeing the job finished out there and in seeing American boys permitted to come home than I have about what weapons are used against the people who are seeking to kill Americans. The Vietcong have not been particular in their choice of weapons, even against civilians.

The agent which has been used is non-lethal. It is disabling for only a limited time—5 to 15 minutes. It is used by major police forces of the world and was issued to the Vietnamese for riot control. It was humane considerations that caused the nonlethal substance to be used against the Vietcong under circumstances where South Vietnamese also could have been killed or wounded had other weapons been used. It would appear that the bleeding hearts would recognize the fact that the South Vietnamese are doing the Vietcong a favor when they use temporarily disabling nonlethal weapons. Certainly, this is preferable to napalm which burns its victims to death or shrapnel which blows them to bits or nuclear devices which destroy everyone and everything.

True assessment of the situation should show that the more important thing is backing our own country in its world problems.

A PROMISE TO REDEEM

(Mr. FARNUM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, 95 years is a very long time. Such a span has seen most of the advances that make our country the world's envy. And that is not so surprising when it is considered that such a period of years takes the Nation back past the Custer massacre into the days when the West was yet untamed.

It is difficult to visualize the world of 95 years ago, and the way Americans of 1870 lived. Their way of life we would call, possibly, primitive. And yet there was nothing primitive about the thinking of Americans who lived then.

They planted the seeds of progress that so many of us enjoy today. Out of their foresight and imagination grew fantastic inventions, great national wealth, fabulous advances in self-government.

Chicago burned and was rebuilt, and rebuilt again. The dark continent of Africa was explored and opened. Great industries to meet needs unknown in 1870 came into being to enrich the lives of all of us.

If we look back 95 years, our chests swell with pride, unless we happen to look at one particular day in our history, March 30, 1870.

Up to that day, America had under consideration a proposition contained in language of beautiful clarity.

The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

On March 30, 1870, exactly 95 years ago today, America proudly proclaimed the ratification by the necessary 29 States that made the 15th amendment basic law in our land.

In many areas of our Nation, that promise has been redeemed. These areas tend to be the ones most benefited by the forces for progress unloosed by the foresight of our ancestors. It is perhaps significant that the areas which have been most remiss in redeeming their promise tend to be those which have benefited least from the forces set into motion by the men of 1870?

As a Nation we are now, almost all of us, embarked on the task of making the promise of 95 years ago the realities of today throughout the 50 States. Let us not falter in the task so long delayed, so that the chains which shackle much of our beloved country may finally and for all time be cast aside.

INVESTIGATION OF THE KU KLUX KLAN

(Mr. JOELSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, on March 1, 1961, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I made the request that the House Committee on Un-American Activities investigate the Klan. At that time I said:

Furthermore, I believe that the committee has directed its attention to the extremist activities of the left wing to the almost total exclusion of the dangerous activities of such groups as the American Nazi Party, the White Citizens Council, and the Ku Klux Klan of the extreme right wing. I shall urge that the committee shoulder its obligation to look into these disruptive, riot-inciting, hate-mongering, un-American groups.

I am pleased that there is some evidence at long last we are going to get action. Much valuable time has been lost, and we must have the Committee on Un-American Activities conduct a prompt and a thorough investigation of the Ku Klux Klan. As I said on March 1, 1961:

The committee should consider the circumstances of the organization of these groups and the sources of their financial support.

JOB CORPS COSTS

(Mr. EDMONDSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include a letter.)

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the Nation's outstanding public officials is the man who has made the Peace

Corps a household word on five continents and who now leads President Johnson's war on poverty as Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

In the Washington Post for March 21, 1965, Mr. Sargent Shriver has replied by letter to a most unfair attack which recently appeared in the columns of the Post, on the subject of Job Corps costs. Mr. Shriver's letter will be of keen interest to all who seek an honest perspective:

JOB CORPS COSTS

A news report in your paper recently made an adverse comparison between the total costs to the Government of providing 12 months of basic vocational and citizenship training to our disadvantaged youths in residential training centers under the U.S. Job Corps and the costs only to the student of an academic year at Harvard University.

The dollar costs in these two cases are not comparable, and not much else in the comparison is relevant. The comparison, in fact, is superficial, invidious, and inaccurate.

Harvard students are among the most brilliant, self-reliant, and highly trained youth our Nation can produce. Thousands of dollars have been invested in their education before they ever get to Harvard. Most of them come from good schools and good families, and have lived in communities where much training and preparation has been given to them. The very atmosphere they breathe is helpful to them. They are getting advanced training at the top of our academic system.

Job Corps enrollees come from situations exactly the opposite. They have gotten the worst and cheapest training. Very little has been invested in them by their impoverished parents or by society. They frequently come from broken homes and physical environments conducive to everything but good work habits and good citizenship. The fact is that not only are they not qualified for Harvard; they are unqualified for any kind of job with a real future in America today.

These differences would lead an objective critic to anticipate much higher costs for producing useful citizens out of Job Corps enrollees. Surprisingly, the Job Corps costs are significantly lower, per person, per year than the Harvard costs.

At Harvard, according to a study made by Seymour Harris, the noted Harvard economist, in an article entitled "The Economics of Harvard," the tuition actually charged the student is only one-third the educational cost to the university. The cost of tuition and room and board to the student at Harvard is \$2,890, according to the 1964 Official Register. Add to this cost to the student the factors outlined by Seymour Harris and you get \$6,410 per annum as the cost of an academic-year Harvard education.

On the other hand, the total cost to the Government for a Job Corps enrollee for 9 months is only \$4,650—about two-thirds of the cost of a Harvard education, and this figure includes \$1,500 for allowances, travel, clothing, and major medical expenses, which are not even included in the Harvard costs cited above. When these items are excluded, the cost of 9 months in the Job Corps is only \$3,100, less than half the cost of 9 months at Harvard.

Furthermore, these cost estimates for Job Corps are figured on present enrollment plans and include initial startup expenses. Once the program is in full-scale operation at full strength, these costs could easily drop substantially.

The real test for both a Harvard education and a Job Corps education is not how much it costs, however, but how successful the graduates are. No one doubts that it is worth the cost of a Harvard education to